

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-10 have been cancelled as drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 11 and 14 are amended with this reply. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 11-18 remain pending.

Support for the amendments is found in the specification as originally filed, for example, at paragraph 29 on page 8. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants with this reply have filed an Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the art cited there and return an initialed Form 1449 with the next Office Action.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-10 as drawn to a non-elected invention.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Abstract has been amended to remove language that can be implied. Applicants respectfully request the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the Lutkus reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,224,311) in view of the Whitford Paper (“11 Reasons Why Chromium-free Xylan® 5230 is specified by DaimlerChrysler, Ford and General Motors”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

For a rejection of claims over a combination of references to be sustained, the references when combined must teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. If any element of amended claims is not present when the references are combined rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The combined references do not teach or suggest every element of the amended claims. Specifically, the independent claims 11 and 14 have been amended to recite that the inserts coated with a chromate-free polymer composition perform better in a torque test when compared with inserts coated with fluoropolymer compositions that do contain chromate. This feature of the invention is fully disclosed, for example at paragraph 29 on page 8. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest this limitation of the amended claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection as applied to the amended claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above, Applicants believe that claims 11-18 are in an allowable condition and respectfully request an early notice of such allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned Applicant's representative if that would be helpful to resolving any issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 5, 2005

By: Mark A. Frentrup

Robert M. Siminski
Reg. No. 36,007
Mark A. Frentrup
Reg. No. 41,026
Attorneys for Applicant

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RMS/MAF/cg